

Mark A. Knueve (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Daniel J. Clark (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 Adam J. Rocco (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR and PEASE LLP  
 52 East Gay Street, P.O. Box 1008  
 Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008  
 Phone: 614.464.6436  
 Fax: 614.464.8054  
 Email: maknueve@vorys.com  
 djclark@vorys.com  
 ajrocco@vorys.com

Yvette Davis, State Bar No. 165777  
 HAIGHT, BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP  
 2050 Main Street, Suite 600  
 Irvine, CA 92614  
 Phone: 714.426.4607  
 Fax: 714.754.0826  
 Email: ydavis@hbblaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Big Lots Stores, Inc. and PNS Stores, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

VIOLA HUBBS, BRANDON  
 COLEMAN, TAMIKA WILLIAMS,  
 individually and on behalf of other  
 members of the general public  
 similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BIG LOTS STORES, INC., an Ohio  
 corporation; PNS STORES, INC., an  
 Ohio corporation; and DOES 1  
 through 10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:15-cv-01601-JAK-ASx  
**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO  
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR  
 RECONSIDERATION**

**Honorable: John A. Kronstadt**

Date: September 24, 2018  
 Time: 8:30 A.M.  
 Ctrm: 10B

Pretrial Conference: October 29, 2018  
 Trial: November 13, 2018

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Although the *Troester* Court held that California had not adopted the federal  
 3 de minimis standard,<sup>1</sup> the Court acknowledged that a de minimis defense may  
 4 nonetheless exist under California law. The Court declined to provide a standard for  
 5 such a California de minimis defense, holding only that the defense was not  
 6 available under the facts of the case before it. *Troester* thus does not require this  
 7 Court to reconsider its summary judgment decisions in this case because the facts of  
 8 this case are distinguishable from the *Troester* facts in every material respect. Since  
 9 *Troester* was limited to its facts, it does not apply here.

10 Additionally, the Court should not reconsider its decision on Plaintiffs’  
 11 derivative penalty claims, which require Plaintiffs to prove that Defendants acted  
 12 willfully or intentionally. There is obviously no legitimate basis for Plaintiffs to  
 13 argue willfulness or intentional conduct here.

14 **II. ARGUMENT**

15 **A. The *Troester* Court limited its decision to the facts of that case.**

16 Although the *Troester* Court held that “California’s wage and hour statutes  
 17 [and] regulations [had not] adopted the de minimis doctrine found in the federal Fair  
 18 Labor Standards Act,” the Court “decline[d] to decide whether a de minimis  
 19 principle may ever apply to wage and hour claims given the wide range of scenarios  
 20 in which this issue arises.” *Troester v. Starbucks Corp.*, 2018 Cal. LEXIS 5312, at  
 21 \*3, 20 (July 26, 2018). Instead, the Court decided “only whether the de minimis rule  
 22 is applicable to the facts of this case as described by the Ninth Circuit,” and  
 23 determined that the defense was not available under those facts. *Id.* at 21.

24 In short, *Troester* limited its holding to the facts before it. As set forth below,  
 25 the facts here are materially distinguishable from the facts in *Troester*. As a result,  
 26 the Court should not reconsider and reverse its prior decisions in this case.

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Under the federal standard, daily amounts of up to ten minutes can be de minimis.

1           **B. The facts here are distinguishable from the facts in *Troester*.**

2           *Troester* involved a single management-level employee, Douglas Troester.  
 3 The *Troester* Court analyzed the tasks performed by Troester “off the clock,” the  
 4 regularity of the work, the amount of “off the clock” time per shift, and the  
 5 aggregate amount of “off the clock” time across Troester’s employment. In every  
 6 material respect, the *Troester* facts are distinguishable from the facts present here.

7           With regard to the tasks performed by Troester, the Court stated as follows:

8           Troester submitted evidence that during the alleged class  
 9 period, Starbucks’ computer software required him to  
 10 clock out on every closing shift before initiating the  
 11 software’s “close store procedure” on a separate computer  
 12 terminal in the back office. The close store procedure  
 13 transmitted daily sales, profit and loss, and store inventory  
 14 to Starbuck’s corporate headquarters. After Troester  
 15 completed this task, he activated the alarm, exited the  
 16 store, and locked the front door. Troester also submitted  
 17 evidence that he walked his coworkers to their cars in  
 18 compliance with Starbuck’s policy. In addition, Troester  
 19 submitted evidence that he occasionally reopened the store  
 20 to allow employees to retrieve items they left behind,  
 21 waited with employees for their rides to arrive, or brought  
 22 in store patio furniture mistakenly left outside.

23 *Troester*, at \*4-5. Significantly, Starbucks and Troester stipulated that all of these  
 24 tasks were compensable. *Id* at \*21.

25           Here, in contrast, after clock out, the manager on duty only had to set the  
 26 alarm and lock the front door.<sup>2</sup> ECF 287 at pp. 5-6. Non-management employees  
 27 had no tasks to perform and simply left after the alarm was set. *Id*. No employee was  
 28 required to initiate a software procedure after clocking out. There is no evidence that  
 any employee was required to walk coworkers to their cars, and no evidence that

29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525  
 526  
 527  
 528  
 529  
 530  
 531  
 532  
 533  
 534  
 535  
 536  
 537  
 538  
 539  
 540  
 541  
 542  
 543  
 544  
 545  
 546  
 547  
 548  
 549  
 550  
 551  
 552  
 553  
 554  
 555  
 556  
 557  
 558  
 559  
 560  
 561  
 562  
 563  
 564  
 565  
 566  
 567  
 568  
 569  
 570  
 571  
 572  
 573  
 574  
 575  
 576  
 577  
 578  
 579  
 580  
 581  
 582  
 583  
 584  
 585  
 586  
 587  
 588  
 589  
 590  
 591  
 592  
 593  
 594  
 595  
 596  
 597  
 598  
 599  
 600  
 601  
 602  
 603  
 604  
 605  
 606  
 607  
 608  
 609  
 610  
 611  
 612  
 613  
 614  
 615  
 616  
 617  
 618  
 619  
 620  
 621  
 622  
 623  
 624  
 625  
 626  
 627  
 628  
 629  
 630  
 631  
 632  
 633  
 634  
 635  
 636  
 637  
 638  
 639  
 640  
 641  
 642  
 643  
 644  
 645  
 646  
 647  
 648  
 649  
 650  
 651  
 652  
 653  
 654  
 655  
 656  
 657  
 658  
 659  
 660  
 661  
 662  
 663  
 664  
 665  
 666  
 667  
 668  
 669  
 670  
 671  
 672  
 673  
 674  
 675  
 676  
 677  
 678  
 679  
 680  
 681  
 682  
 683  
 684  
 685  
 686  
 687  
 688  
 689  
 690  
 691  
 692  
 693  
 694  
 695  
 696  
 697  
 698  
 699  
 700  
 701  
 702  
 703  
 704  
 705  
 706  
 707  
 708  
 709  
 710  
 711  
 712  
 713  
 714  
 715  
 716  
 717  
 718  
 719  
 720  
 721  
 722  
 723  
 724  
 725  
 726  
 727  
 728  
 729  
 730  
 731  
 732  
 733  
 734  
 735  
 736  
 737  
 738  
 739  
 740  
 741  
 742  
 743  
 744  
 745  
 746  
 747  
 748  
 749  
 750  
 751  
 752  
 753  
 754  
 755  
 756  
 757  
 758  
 759  
 760  
 761  
 762  
 763  
 764  
 765  
 766  
 767  
 768  
 769  
 770  
 771  
 772  
 773  
 774  
 775  
 776  
 777  
 778  
 779  
 780  
 781  
 782  
 783  
 784  
 785  
 786  
 787  
 788  
 789  
 790  
 791  
 792  
 793  
 794  
 795  
 796  
 797  
 798  
 799  
 800  
 801  
 802  
 803  
 804  
 805  
 806  
 807  
 808  
 809  
 810  
 811  
 812  
 813  
 814  
 815  
 816  
 817  
 818  
 819  
 820  
 821  
 822  
 823  
 824  
 825  
 826  
 827  
 828  
 829  
 830  
 831  
 832  
 833  
 834  
 835  
 836  
 837  
 838  
 839  
 840  
 841  
 842  
 843  
 844  
 845  
 846  
 847  
 848  
 849  
 850  
 851  
 852  
 853  
 854  
 855  
 856  
 857  
 858  
 859  
 860  
 861  
 862  
 863  
 864  
 865  
 866  
 867  
 868  
 869  
 870  
 871  
 872  
 873  
 874  
 875  
 876  
 877  
 878  
 879  
 880  
 881  
 882  
 883  
 884  
 885  
 886  
 887  
 888  
 889  
 890  
 891  
 892  
 893  
 894  
 895  
 896  
 897  
 898  
 899  
 900  
 901  
 902  
 903  
 904  
 905  
 906  
 907  
 908  
 909  
 910  
 911  
 912  
 913  
 914  
 915  
 916  
 917  
 918  
 919  
 920  
 921  
 922  
 923  
 924  
 925  
 926  
 927  
 928  
 929  
 930  
 931  
 932  
 933  
 934  
 935  
 936  
 937  
 938  
 939  
 940  
 941  
 942  
 943  
 944  
 945  
 946  
 947  
 948  
 949  
 950  
 951  
 952  
 953  
 954  
 955  
 956  
 957  
 958  
 959  
 960  
 961  
 962  
 963  
 964  
 965  
 966  
 967  
 968  
 969  
 970  
 971  
 972  
 973  
 974  
 975  
 976  
 977  
 978  
 979  
 980  
 981  
 982  
 983  
 984  
 985  
 986  
 987  
 988  
 989  
 990  
 991  
 992  
 993  
 994  
 995  
 996  
 997  
 998  
 999  
 1000

1 any employee was required to reopen the store to retrieve items, wait for rides to  
 2 arrive, or bring in store patio furniture. Moreover, as discussed in more detail below,  
 3 the parties have not stipulated that this time is compensable.

4 With regard to regularity, the *Troester* Court noted that the district court had  
 5 **acknowledged** that “Troester’s store closing activities were regularly occurring”  
 6 and performed “on a daily basis.” *Troester*, at \*6, 21. Here, in contrast, the Court  
 7 found that the evidence was **not** sufficient to show regularity. ECF 287 at p. 11.  
 8 Plaintiff Brandon Coleman “testified that most of the time he did not work the  
 9 closing shift.” ECF 287 at p. 2. The Court also noted that there were declarations  
 10 from Class Members stating that they did not regularly work closing shifts, and that  
 11 the parties’ experts opined that Class Members worked a shift with a “gap”  
 12 somewhere between one in every 5.6 shifts and one in every 20 shifts. *Id.* at 10-11.  
 13 This is obviously materially distinguishable from the “daily” situation in *Troester*.

14 With regard to the amount of time per shift, Troester’s “closing tasks required  
 15 Troester to work four to 10 additional minutes each day.” *Troester* at \*5. Here, the  
 16 Court noted that there was “evidence that Class Members left their stores less than  
 17 two minutes after clocking out, and some Class Members declared that this process  
 18 lasted only a few seconds.”<sup>3</sup> ECF 287 at p. 8. Plaintiff’s expert opined that the  
 19 median “gap” was 2.33 minutes. *Id.* Defendant’s expert opined that the median  
 20 “gap” across the entire class period was 2.35 minutes, and only 1.4 minutes under  
 21 the more accurate Empower time-keeping system. *Id.* at pp. 8-9. Again, the evidence  
 22 here is materially distinguishable from the evidence in *Troester*.

23 Finally, with regard to the aggregate amount of time, the *Troester* Court  
 24 stated: “Over the 17-month period of his employment, Troester’s unpaid time

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
 26 <sup>3</sup> Coleman testified that it “took about a minute” to set the alarm, and that depending  
 27 on the number of people on the closing shift he would spend one to five minutes  
 28 after clocking out. ECF 287 at p. 8.

1 totaled approximately 12 hours and 50 minutes.” *Troester* at \*6. Here, in contrast,  
 2 the Court found that “over a 14-month period, [Coleman’s] total “gap” time was 43  
 3 minutes” — less than one hour. ECF 287 at fn 2. With regard to Class Members,  
 4 Plaintiff’s expert found that the median aggregate amount of time was 26.4 minutes  
 5 (less than an hour), and Defendant’s expert found that the median aggregate amount  
 6 was 6 minutes.<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 8-9. This is materially distinguishable from the nearly 13  
 7 hours of unpaid time that *Troester* worked.

8 In summary, *Troester* was limited to its facts, which are distinguishable in  
 9 every material respect from the facts in the present case. *Troester* does not require  
 10 this Court to reconsider or reverse its prior decision.<sup>5</sup>

11 **C. This case is distinguishable from *Troester* because the “gap” is not**  
 12 **compensable time.**

13 As discussed above, *Troester* performed a number of tasks after clocking out,  
 14 and the parties in that case stipulated that all of those tasks were compensable.

15 Here, in contrast, the parties have not stipulated that the “gap” is  
 16 compensable. After clock out, non-management employees perform no tasks. They  
 17 simply gather their belongings, walk to the front of the store, and exit. This time is

---

18 <sup>4</sup> Plaintiffs’ expert opined that the mean aggregate “gap” for Class Members was  
 19 143.4 minutes. This is misleading because it excluded employees who did not  
 20 experience a “gap,” and included a few outliers who dramatically drove up the  
 21 average. Nonetheless, even this inflated number is materially distinguishable from  
 22 the nearly 13 hours at issue in *Troester*.

23 <sup>5</sup> Plaintiffs also ask the Court to reconsider its decision granting summary judgment  
 24 on Plaintiffs’ individual bag check claim. Those facts are even more distinguishable  
 25 from *Troester*. As this Court found, Coleman almost never had a bag check, and  
 26 spent “little or no time on bag checks ... in most shifts.” ECF 118, p. 9. Hubbs  
 27 testified that the process took only “two, three seconds” and that she would  
 sometimes not bring a bag to work, which meant she would not have a bag check.  
*Id.* Bag checks thus did not occur on a “regular” or “daily basis” and the amount of  
 time was significantly less than the daily four to ten minutes spent in *Troester*.

1 not compensable. Meanwhile, the only tasks performed by the manager are setting  
 2 the alarm (which takes a few seconds) and locking the door. ECF 287 at p. 6. The  
 3 only arguably compensable tasks—setting the alarm and locking the door—are  
 4 performed by one employee and take a few seconds.

5 A similar circumstance was addressed in *Chavez v. Converse, Inc.*, 2017 U.S.  
 6 Dist. LEXIS 169167, \*24 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2017), in which the court stated:

7 It does not make sense to compensate employees for time  
 8 spent packing up and walking to the exit because store  
 9 employees pack up and then walk to the exit with or  
 10 without an exit inspection. Indeed, there is no indication  
 11 that an employee could not use the restroom, socialize,  
 12 request a Lyft, or purchase merchandise before undergoing  
 the exit inspection. As far as the Court knows, Converse  
 does not control its employees or foreclose on their  
 activities while they pack up and walk to the exit.

13 Similarly, here, it would not make sense to compensate employees for time  
 14 gathering belongings or walking to the front door.<sup>6</sup>

15 This further distinguishes *Troester* and also underscores the truly de minimis  
 16 nature of the time here. The only “tasks” performed are setting the alarm and  
 17 locking the door, which are performed by the manager only, and which only take  
 18 seconds. By any objective and rationale measure, this is de minimis.

19 **D. The Court should not reconsider its decision on Plaintiffs’ derivative**  
 20 **penalty claims because Defendants were not willful.**

21 Plaintiffs cannot recover penalties under Code Sections 203, 204,<sup>7</sup> and 226,<sup>8</sup>  
 22 or liquidated damages under Section 1194.2, because there can be no question that

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
 24 <sup>6</sup> This is particularly true in those instances when an employee spent more than a  
 25 minute or two between clocking out and setting the alarm. Since it only takes a few  
 seconds to set the alarm, there is no reason to believe that any employee would be  
 performing “work” during a longer period of time.

26 <sup>7</sup> Plaintiffs’ claim under Cal. Lab. Code § 204 (Seventh Cause of Action) fails  
 27 because no private right of action exists under Section 204. *See, e.g., Unger v.*



Big Lots did not act willfully or intentionally. Where there is a “good faith dispute” in law, the conduct is not willful or intentional, regardless of whether or not there is an actual violation.<sup>9</sup> See ECF at 196 at 28-35. “A ‘good faith dispute’ that any wages are due occurs when an employer presents a defense, based in law or in fact which, if successful, would preclude any recovery on the part of the employee. The fact that a defense is ultimately unsuccessful will not preclude a finding that a good faith dispute did exist.” *Amaral v. Cintas Corp. No. 2*, 163 Cal. App. 4th 1157, 1201 (2008). Legal uncertainty as to the merits of a claim provides an employer with a presumption of a good faith dispute. *Id.* at 1202 (citing *Armenta v. Osmose, Inc.*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 314 (2005)); cf. *Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Burr*, 551 U.S. 47, 69-70 (2007) (penalties improper where there are multiple, reasonable interpretations of law); *Home Depot*, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145120, \*10 (summary judgment on section 203 and 226 claims where good faith dispute as to whether workday designation was improper).

---

*Fannie Mae*, No. SACV 15-00951-CJC(JCx), 2015 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 93491, at \*6 (C.D. Cal. July 16, 2015); see also ECF 196 at 33.

<sup>8</sup> Plaintiffs’ claims under Section 226 fail for the separate reason that Plaintiffs do not allege that their wage statements incorrectly reflected the amounts that were actually paid; they allege that the wage statements did not include the “gap” time. This claim is not actionable under California law. *Maldonado v. Epsilon Plastics, Inc.*, 22 Cal. App. 5<sup>th</sup> 1308 (2018).

<sup>9</sup> Section 203 provides for penalties only when an employer “willfully” fails to pay wages at the time an employee is terminated. Cal. Lab. Code § 203. Section 226 provides for penalties only when a plaintiff can establish a “knowing and intentional” failure to provide accurate wage statements. See Cal. Lab. Code § 226(e). A court may decline to impose liquidated damages under Section 1194.2, if an employer shows that (1) it had “reasonable grounds for believing the act or omission” giving rise to the penalties did not violate California law, and (2) the act or omission was in good faith...” Cal. Lab. Code § 1194.2(b).

Defendants reasonably believe that Big Lots' closing shift process is legally compliant because any "gap" between the time when an employee clocks out and the time the alarm is set is de minimis. This Court agreed with Defendants (ECF ECF 118 at 9-10; ECF 123 at 8-9; ECF 287), as did numerous other Courts and the DLSE. (ECF 196 at 20-21). Indeed, when certifying the question in *Troester*, the Ninth Circuit stated that two of its panels had previously applied the *de minimis* doctrine to California wage claims in the absence of a determination on the issue by the California Supreme Court. 680 Fed. App'x at 513 (citing *Corbin v. Time Warner Entm't-Advance/Newhouse P'ship*, 821 F.3d 1069, 1083 (9th Cir. 2016); *Gillings v. Time Warner Cable LLC*, 583 Fed. App'x 712 (9th Cir. 2014)). Defendants thus had a good faith belief that the "gap" was de minimis. *See Barnhill v. Robert Saunders & Co.*, 125 Cal. App. 3d 1, 177 Cal. Rptr. 803, 804 (1981) (penalties not appropriate where employer setoff employee debt with wages upon employee's discharge because at time California courts were divided as to when employer had right to "set off" employee's debt). Accordingly, the Court should not reconsider its prior decision granting summary judgment on Plaintiffs' derivative penalty claims.

**E. To the extent the Court reconsiders its summary judgment decisions, it should also reconsider its decision granting class certification.**

In the event the Court reconsiders its decisions granting summary judgment, the Court should also reconsider its decision granting class certification to the Closing Shift class.<sup>10</sup> Determining whether an undefined California de minimis standard applies to each and every class member would involve thousands of individualized inquiries. This is particularly true because the compensability of the "gap" (or a portion of the "gap") would depend on what the class member was doing

<sup>10</sup> "[A] district court may decertify a class at any time." *Rodriguez v. West Publ'g Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 966 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal citations omitted).



1 during the time. In *Stiller v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 298 F.R.D. 611, 628 (S.D.  
2 Cal. 2014), the court refused to certify a similar class and stated:

3 [D]etermining whether the Alleged Policy existed, was enforced on a  
4 companywide basis, and operated in a way that resulted in employees  
5 being under Costco's control, will only answer the question of whether  
6 employees were sometimes detained without pay as a result of the Alleged  
7 Policy. ... Costco has offered convincing evidence that not all employees  
8 experienced unpaid delay as a result of the Alleged Policy.... And, if it can  
only be determined on a classwide basis whether the Alleged Policy  
sometimes resulted in unpaid [off the clock] time, individualized  
determinations will be required to determine the question of liability. This  
is because liability hinges on whether employees actually performed [off  
the clock] work.

9 *Id.* at 624-25 (emphasis original). See also *Koike v. Starbucks Corp.*, 378 Fed.  
10 App'x 659, 661-62 (9th Cir. 2010) (affirming denial of class certification based on  
11 finding that "individualized factual determinations were required to determine  
12 whether class members did in fact engage in OTC work and whether [the employer]  
13 had actual or constructive knowledge of the OTC work performed."); *Heffelfinger v.*  
14 *Elec. Data Sys. Corp.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 201979 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2013)  
15 (decertifying class after summary judgment was partially reversed).

### 16 **III. CONCLUSION**

17 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Court  
18 deny Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration.

19 Dated: August 27, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP

Mark A. Knueve

Daniel J. Clark

Adam J. Rocco

HAIGHT, BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP

Yvette Davis

By: /s/ Mark A. Knueve

Mark A. Knueve

Big Lots Stores, Inc. and PNS Stores, Inc.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on August 27, 2018, the foregoing was filed with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Central District of California via the Court's CM/ECF system.

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Mark A. Knueve  
Mark A. Knueve